

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
Acting United States Attorney
KATHLEEN A. SERVATIUS
Assistant United States Attorney
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JULIO CHAVEZ,
DENISE CASTRO,
DESTANEY WALKER, and
BRYAN SAHAGUN, et. al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00062 NONE-SKO

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE STATUS
CONFERENCE AND ORDER**

Date: April 21, 2021
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Honorable Sheila K. Oberto

The United States of America, by and through MCGREGOR W. SCOTT, United States Attorney, and KATHLEEN A. SERVATIUS, Assistant United States Attorneys, and the defendants, by and through their respective attorneys of record, hereby stipulate to continue their status conference from April 21, 2021 until July 21, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California until further notice. This General Order was entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19. Further, pursuant to General Order 611 and 620, this Court's declaration of judicial emergency under 18 U.S.C. § 3174, and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council's Order of April 16, 2020 continuing this Court's judicial emergency, this Court has allowed district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after May 1, 2021.¹

¹ A judge "may order case-by-case exceptions" at the discretion of that judge "or upon the
STIPULATION TO CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE

Although the General Orders and declaration of emergency address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. And moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering and ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, 618, and 620 and the subsequent declaration of judicial emergency require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

The General Orders and declaration of judicial emergency exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020).

1 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following
 2 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-
 3 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).² If continued, this Court should designate a new date
 4 for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any
 5 pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

6 The parties request that time be excluded between April 21, 2021 and July 21, 2021 p.m. for the
 7 following reasons: the defendants need additional time to review the discovery, consult with their
 8 clients, and conduct further investigation. The case involves several seizures, approximately 500 pages
 9 of discovery, and discovery in the form of several gigabytes. Supplemental discovery consisting of
 10 digital phone downloads was provided in the last six months. . The proposed status conference date
 11 represents the earliest date that all counsel are available thereafter, taking into account counsels’
 12 schedules, defense counsels’ commitments to other clients, and the need for preparation in the case and
 13 further investigation. In addition, the public health concerns cited by General Order 611, 612, and 617
 14 and presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in this
 15 case because counsel or other relevant individuals have been encouraged to telework and minimize
 16 personal contact to the greatest extent possible. It will be difficult to avoid personal contact should the
 17 hearing proceed.

18 The parties further believe that time should be excluded, in that failure to grant the requested
 19 case schedule would unreasonably deny the defendants continuity of counsel, and unreasonably deny
 20 both the defendants and the government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking
 21 into account the parties’ due diligence in prosecuting this case. 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
 22 Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by the schedule as requested outweigh the
 23 interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial
 24 Act. Therefore, the parties request that the Court exclude the time until the new status conference date
 25 from calculations under the Speedy Trial Act.

26
 27 ² The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make
 28 “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.
 Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 Dated: April 14, 2021

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
Acting United States Attorney

2
3 /s/ Kathleen A. Servatius

4 KATHLEEN A. SERVATIUS
Assistant United States Attorney

5
6 Dated: April 14, 2021

/s/ Marc Days

Attorney for Defendant Julio Chavez

7
8 Dated: April 14, 2021

/s/ Kevin P. Rooney

Attorney for Defendant Dennise Castro

9
10 Dated: April 14, 2021

/s/ Anthony P. Capozzi

Attorney for Defendant Destaney Walker

11
12 Dated: April 14, 2021

/s/ Monica Bermudez

Attorney for Defendant Bryan Sahagun

13
14 **ORDER**

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the status conference in this case, except as to defendant
16 CHAVEZ, be continued from April 21, 2021, until July 21, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the ends of justice served by the schedule set forth herein as
18 requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendants in a trial within the original date
19 prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act for the reasons stated in the parties' stipulation. For the purpose of
20 computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must
21 commence, the time period of April 21, 2021, until July 21, 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable
22 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court
23 at the parties' request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such
24 action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26
27 Dated: **April 16, 2021**

/s/ Sheila K. Olerto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE